

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Religion, Law, and the Land: Native Americans and the Judicial Interpretation of Sacred Land. By Brian Edward Brown.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4347s7hm>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 25(3)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Wilkins, David E.

Publication Date

2001-06-01

DOI

10.17953

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

The concern for space has limited the depth of the authors' explorations of Curtis's images. As it is, the book focuses less on Curtis's images of the Plains and more on the aesthetics and motivations of Western photographers. While Sandweiss and Niatum provide essential background material, Gidley's essay most impressively investigates the collective effort that is *The North American Indian*. Most importantly, Gidley's examination of the different "ways of seeing" Curtis's work ultimately includes "the perspectives of the subjects of the project" (p. 50). Rarely has an author apprised both sides of the photographic relationship, given the lack of early writings by Native subjects regarding the exchange. In a recently released documentary, film director and producer Anne Makepeace touches on this exchange and has integrated Curtis's life story with reactions from the Native people he photographed or their closest descendants. By doing this she illustrates the interaction between the controversial photographer and his subjects. Her documentary film, *Coming to Light: Edward S. Curtis and the North American Indians* (2000), is an excellent retrospect on the life of Edward Curtis and, at the same time, gives consideration to the individuals he photographed.

Despite the limitations of the book's intended examination of Curtis's Plains images, the work introduces key issues in the study of nineteenth and early-twentieth century photography of Native American peoples. The essays also provide an extensive bibliography for any scholar of Curtis's work, as well as for historians of American photography. This is especially true of Gidley's sources, as he uses many unpublished and uncollected materials. While this volume is merely groundwork for a deeper study of Curtis's photogravures and how they relate to Native culture areas, the authors address significant issues relating to how we examine and reexamine photography of Native American peoples.

Alexandra N. Harris

University of California, Los Angeles

Religion, Law, and the Land: Native Americans and the Judicial Interpretation of Sacred Land. By Brian Edward Brown. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1999. 199 pages. \$59.95 cloth.

When the Bush Administration released its National Energy Policy in May 2001, a policy broadly designed to expedite corporate extraction of nonrenewable natural resources by significantly easing environmental regulations that had only recently been installed to provide some safeguards for the environment, indigenous peoples, concerned private citizens, environmentalists, and other activists organizations were put on notice that Bush's mantra of "compassionate conservatism" did not include any "compassion," much less actual "conservation," for the natural world.

Of course, the majority of Americans that did not vote for Bush, and most of those who did cast their ballots for him, already knew this. Bush's environmental record was one of the most important issues in the election, and with

the Bush-Cheney team having concocted an energy “crisis” to justify their plans to drill for oil in the Arctic, to revive the nation’s nuclear program, and to undermine the Kyoto Accord on global warming, supporters of the environment and those people most dependent on the land and her bounty, including Native nations, prepared to do battle once again.

Brian Brown’s slim book, *Religion, Law, and the Land*, one of the titles in Greenwood Press’ Contributions in Legal Studies series, is a solid, if abbreviated, addition to the growing legal literature examining the federal judiciary’s generally consistent failure to provide constitutional or trust-based protection to indigenous peoples’ spiritual/spatial rights on lands and waters deemed essential to their vitality as natural communities. Brown provides a detailed critical legal analysis of five federal district and appellate cases—*Sequoyah v. Tennessee Valley Authority* (1977, 1980), *Badoni v. Higginson* (1977, 1980), *Wilson v. Block* (1983), *Frank Fools Crow et al. v. Gullet et al.* (1982, 1983), and the precedent-establishing case by the US Supreme Court, *Lyng v. Northwest Indian Cemetery Protective Association* (1988).

The Native peoples involved in these cases were, respectively, the Eastern Band of Cherokee, Navajo medicine people and Navajo chapter officials, the Hopi tribe and the Navajo Medicinemen’s Association, several traditional Lakota and Tsistsista (Cheyenne), and finally representatives of the Yurok, Karok, Tolowa, and other Northwest California Indian nations.

In each case, with the lone exception of the cases preceding the *Lyng* ruling, which were overturned by Justice Sandra Day O’Connor’s opinion, the Native people unsuccessfully sought to protect lands or land features of a sacred nature from development schemes of the federal or state governments or by privately owned firms that were subsidized by the federal government. It is the question of why First Nations (and their constituents, who are also American citizens) were so grossly thwarted regarding their efforts to protect their sacred homelands, even when armed with a bevy of environmental laws, the 1978 American Indian Religious Freedom Act, the First Amendment, specific treaty rights, the federal trust doctrine, and the moral appropriateness of their stance, which is central to Brown, an associate professor and chair of the Religious Studies Department at Iona College.

The short answer to his question is that the federal courts act from a legal consciousness and cultural predisposition toward the earth that “sees land solely in terms of human exploitation . . . [a perspective that] is blind to the inherent value of land other than what it may yield for human use” (p. 1) and religion that is “separable and essentially discrete from the land” and as “primarily the conceptual faith to which one subscribes rather than an integral way of being and living” (p. 5). Such a narrow and human-centered conception of the environment and religion distorts and devalues Native peoples and their culture and completely misunderstands and misrepresents their unique relationship to the natural world.

Brown pursued his goal by synthesizing studies of religion, philosophy, legal analysis, and indigenous culture. Methodologically and substantively, he approached his task by relying almost exclusively (only one secondary source is cited) on the legal record generated by these five cases, including the state

and federal statutes, complaints, responses, motions argued, affidavits submitted, reports, studies associated with the litigation, correspondence, petitions, amicus curiae, and the published rulings of the various federal courts.

While such an approach certainly makes for an elegant study, by ignoring prior historical, political, legal, and ethnohistorical scholarship, the actual parties involved in the cases, and the political/legislative hearing and reports, we are left with a much too abbreviated and stark view of an extremely complex and dynamic set of issues that begs for a deeper, more nuanced, and more historically robust examination. Unfortunately, he claims that there are no other books that maintain such an expansive concern for the environment or detail how harmful the federal courts opinions are because they are rooted in a “paradigm of land as property.” But surely such studies exists, as even a cursory review of a good Native American studies bibliography will show.

Besides the methodological and substantive concerns, the other critical issue is the author’s failure to adequately explain how Indians and their allies were able to secure legal victories at the district and appellate levels in the *Lyng* litigation, although their hopes were later shattered by the Supreme Court’s decision which overturned those rulings. While he describes District Judge Weigel’s opinion and the appellate ruling, readers are not given reasons explaining these impressive if temporary victories, which were all the more remarkable considering the previously debilitating judicial losses he had already discussed. At the district level, did the Indians win because of the ample evidence presented in the Theodoratus Report, which said that the road should not be built because it would violate the Indian’s religious rights? Did it matter that the Indians had a number of allies in the litigation, including the State of California and a host of environmental groups? At the appellate level, was victory secured because one of the judges, William Canby, had a good deal of federal Indian law experience, having authored a leading text on the subject? These are plausible questions that might have been explored more fully.

Notwithstanding these two important dimensions, the book is a well-written work that confirms what indigenous peoples have known for many generations: there remains a virtually unbridgeable philosophical, emotional, and cultural gulf in the way humans relate to and understand the natural world that still separates many Native peoples, most corporate and governmental bodies, and their representatives. Despite their sovereign standing as nations, citizenship status as individuals, and the fact that “law” is often on their side, indigenous peoples find that their views and natural relations—whether in the form of a watershed, mountain peak, rock archway, or other sacred site—rarely receive the respect or protection they are entitled to.

And as Brown shows in his conclusion, these court cases, and especially the Supreme Court’s *Lyng* decision, are deeply significant because these holdings are not limited to Native peoples and their ceremonial traditions alone. In fact, *Lyng* and its predecessor cases are a “reflection and codification of a broader cultural orientation toward land and the natural world,” and are therefore of “exceptional historic consequence” (p. 172). Brown hopes these decisions will serve to ignite politicians, jurists, and corporate executives to take stock of their own place in the cosmos and make more environmentally

appropriate decisions regarding the natural world; decisions that will benefit all peoples, including those Native peoples who still depend on nature to maintain their cultural identity.

David E. Wilkins

University of Minnesota

Sing with the Heart of a Bear: Fusions of Native and American Poetry, 1890–1999. By Kenneth Lincoln. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2000. 435 pages. \$50.00 cloth; \$19.95 paper.

In *Sing with the Heart of a Bear*, Kenneth Lincoln offers a comparative study of Native and American poetry, showing that similarities outweigh differences. As the subtitle suggests, the book celebrates interchange over separatism and emphasizes the positive crossing of cultural borders. By including twenty-eight Native poets (one poem for each of them) and a thorough analysis of several of the most representative American modernists, Lincoln expands the Lakota concept of kinship (*Mitakuye oyasin*, all my relatives) and evinces America's need for "a fusional model of mutual interest" where it is possible "to share understanding, value, power, and grace" (p. 71). Lincoln introduces the concept of a "hybrid poetics," in which ethnic differences matter less than basic elements common to all human beings. He embraces Mary Austin's idea of the "native savage" as "the new Adamic American" (p. 280) to illustrate how modernist and postmodernist poets came to see Native American cultures as the genuine primitive still in contact with nature and closely related to local landscape. Since race and culture are social constructs, Lincoln explains, America is simply a mixture of different cultures, all contributing to its identity. The truly hybrid poetics becomes possible, therefore, only if conflicts of ethnicity and gender are successfully resolved through the peaceful acceptance of differences.

The strength of this book is that while it celebrates a cultural and literary fusion of various experiences, it also underlines the importance of "a reciprocal alterity" (p. 314) in which the Other is not feared or silenced, but recognized and respected. Ethnic differences were valued by twentieth-century American poets, who became interested in Native American culture to recover the primitive, the "natural self" that had been corrupted by civilization (p. 312). At the same time, though, Lincoln identifies the Other with the feminine that had been ignored and disempowered in patriarchal societies because of the potential threat it represented to the established male power. Women write "fusionally" (p. 323), reminding us how Native American poets express their traditional philosophies of life using the literary tools of Western culture. Lincoln celebrates Emily Dickinson's "bear-hearted" weird originality (p. 144), Marianne Moore's high respect for the natural world, Mary Austin's appreciation for the rhythms of Native storytelling, Sylvia Plath's exclusive insistence on "her own writing" (p. 165), Linda Gregg's "microcosmos," where "each woman is an islanded refuge to herself" (p. 326–327), and Sharon Olds's cynical and parodic revelation of the lies that hide the bitter truth of life. Most